DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 518 EA 014 622

AUTHOR Say, Elaine
TITLE Student Achievement as Part of an Incentive Pay Plan for Teachers.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Incentives; *Measurement Techniques; *Merit Pay; Merit Rating; Multiple Regression Analysis; Prediction; *Salary Wage Differentials; School Surveys; Socioeconomic Status; Standardized Tests; Teacher Salaries
IDENTIFIERS *Houston Independent School District TX

ABSTRACT

An incentive pay plan for teachers was implemented in the Houston (Texas) Independent School District in the 1979-80 school year. The "outstanding educational progress" (OEP) component of the plan was based on student performance on standardized tests. Schools were grouped to allow students of similar socioeconomic backgrounds to be compared on test performance. Only schools scoring at or above the median score for their group were eligible. After the first year of implementation, concerns of teachers triggered a study aimed at revamping the OEP component of the plan. A survey of 208 teachers and 182 faculty advisory committees showed that the OEP component is perceived positively by those at schools that were eligible for the OEP stipend and negatively by those at schools that were ineligible. Based on the findings, a new plan was developed that uses regression analysis to predict academic achievement growth. An equation using a number of factors can be used to reliably predict a school's test scores. The predicted scores allow each school to compete against itself as opposed to matching schools of similar socioeconomic status against each other. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217518

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elaine Say

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Student Achievement as Part of an Incentive Pay Plan for Teachers

Elaine Say
Houston Independent School District

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting, March 1981, New York, N. Y.

EA 014 622

Student Achievement as Part of an
Incentive Pay Plan for Teachers

Introduction

The Second Mile Plan, an incentive pay plan for teachers, was implemented in the 1979-80 school year. There are various components of the Second Mile Plan including teacher attendance, high priority location, critical staff shortage, extended day, professional growth, teacher recruitment and outstanding educational progress (OEP). The focus of this study is to examine the attitudes toward the OEP component of the Second Mile Plan as it was implemented in the 1979-80 school year. Furthermore, the purpose of the study is to make a recommendation regarding the appropriate implementation of the OEP component for the future.

The five major purposes of the Second Mile Plan are to

1) reward teachers whose students exhibit high levels of academic growth,

2) stabilize faculties,

3) attract teachers in critical shortage areas,

4) improve teacher attendance, and

5) compensate teachers for extended instructional duty.

(The Second Mile Plan May, 1979, page 1.)

Specifically the outstanding educational progress (OEP) dimension addresses the first purpose of the Second Mile Plan. The OEP stipend was computed for the 1979-80 school year in September, 1980. The following section explains the specific procedures that were implemented to arrive at the designation of OEP campuses.

Calculation of OEP Campuses for 1979-80

Any teacher who met the 1979-80 baseline requirements of the Second Mile Plan was potentially eligible for the Outstanding Educational Progress (OEP) stipend. This dimension of the Second Mile Plan was designed to provide incentive pay to instructional personnel of schools where the average student academic gain is greater than the median for similar schools in HISD.

The following questions address specific details of the OEP dimension:

How were schools grouped for comparison?

The purpose of grouping campuses was to allow campuses with students of similar socio-economic backgrounds to be compared on academic performance. The specific criterion used for grouping campuses was the free and reduced lunch (FRL) rate at the campus for the 1979-80 school year. All elementary campuses (N = 169) were ranked on their FRL rate from lowest to highest. These campuses were divided into 16 groups of 10 campuses per group, and one group consisting of nine (9) campuses. All junior high/middle schools (N = 35) were divided into five (5) groups of six (6) campuses per group, and one (1) group of five (5) campuses. At the high school/special school level (N = 28) campuses were divided into three (3) groups of six (6) campuses per group, one (1) group of seven (7) campuses, and one (1) group of three (3) campuses. This grouping procedure allowed campuses with students with similar socio-economic backgrounds to compete for the OEP stipend.

How was OEP measured?

For all campuses, the following steps were taken for schools in each group:

(1) Scores from the 1978-79 school year were matched with 1979-80 scores.

(2) ITBS composite scores and TASK reading, math, and English scores were converted into Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores. NCE scores describe a student's achievement level in terms of his/her standing within a group. NCE scores, which range from 1 to 99, are derived from percentile ranks and represent equal units of achievement. NCE scores, unlike percentile ranks or grade equivalent scores, are a unit of measurement that can be added, subtracted, and divided to yield a gain score that can be interpreted. A change of five NCE units, for example, represents the same amount of change whether it is from 10 to 15, or 80 to 85. For this reason NCE scores can be averaged across grade levels, across different forms of tests, and even across different tests in some cases. Since OEP calculations require scores to be averaged, NCE scores are the best unit of measure that is available to allow comparisons in achievement growth.

(3) NCE scores for students from the 1978-79 school year were subtracted from their 1979-80 NCE scores to yield an NCE gain score for each student.

(4) These NCE gain scores for students at one campus were averaged to yield an NCE gain score for each campus.

What schools were identified by the process?

After computation of the NCE gain score for each campus in the group, the following steps were taken to identify eligible campuses:

(1) NCE gain scores for campuses in each group were ranked from highest to lowest.

(2) The median NCE gain score for the campuses in the group was determined (the middle score or score at which 50% of the campuses score above or below).

(3) Campuses in each group that had an NCE gain score at or above the median score for the group then became eligible campuses.

Which instructional personnel at these eligible campuses will receive the stipend?

Only instructional personnel who met the baseline requirements for the Second Mile Plan during the 1979-80 school year are eligible to receive the OEP stipend. Teachers who were assigned to the campus in 1979-80, but are no longer assigned to the campus will not be eligible to apply for the stipend unless they were involuntarily transferred from the campus.

Teacher Attitudes Toward the OEP Component

Following the calculation process and designation of eligible campuses, the Research, Evaluation, and Accreditation Department was requested to survey teachers and Faculty Advisory Committees to obtain their attitudes regarding the OEP component. Additionally, other input was obtained from the Area offices and through visits to campuses to explain and discuss the OEP component.

Instructional Staff Survey Results

A brief survey was developed in October, 1980 to solicit the opinions of teachers, nurses, and librarians regarding the OEP component. A five percent random sample of the teaching staff from across the District (N = 525) was mailed a survey from the Research Department. Teachers were asked to complete and return the survey to the Research office (see Appendix A). Responses were received (N = 208) from 40% of the sample by the beginning of November, 1980. The survey results follow.

Question 1: Was the campus you worked at during the 79-80 school year, eligible for the Outstanding Educational Progress stipend?

Results: 63% Yes 33% No 4% Do not know

Because one-half of the schools across the District received the OEP stipend, it is apparent that a greater percentage of teachers at schools where the stipend was received responded to the survey.

Question 2: In your opinion, should teachers be rewarded with a stipend for outstanding educational progress of their students?

Results: 68% Yes 28% No 4% No opinion

A majority of teachers indicated that teachers should be rewarded for outstanding educational progress of their students. An examination of the responses of teachers at eligible and ineligible campuses reveals a definite disparity. A total of 77% of survey respondents from eligible campuses think teachers should be rewarded, while only 53% of the respondents from ineligible campuses believe teachers should be rewarded.

Question 3: Do you think that the OEP component, as it is now designed and implemented, should be continued as a part of the Second Mile Plan?

Results: 45% Yes 50% No 5% No opinion

As a group, survey respondents were fairly evenly divided as to whether the OEP component should be continued. However, only 27% of the respondents from ineligible campuses indicated the OEP component should be continued as is, while 54% of the respondents from eligible campuses wanted the component continued as is.

Responses to the first three items on the survey indicate that the opinions of the teachers from eligible schools are substantially different from those of teachers whose school was not eligible. A majority (77%) of teachers from eligible campuses believe teachers should be rewarded for outstanding educational progress of their students and about half of these teachers feel that the OEP component should be continued as it is now designed.

However, only about half of the respondents from ineligible campuses feel teachers should be rewarded for the outstanding educational progress of their students, and the majority (70%) do not want to see the OEP component continued as it is now designed and implemented.

Survey respondents were requested to give the reason why they thought the OEP component should not be continued. The major reasons given were:

Plan causes teaching of test rather than children (12)

It is wrong to reward teachers for doing the job they're supposed to do (10)

Encourages cheating and test manipulation (9)

Does not recognize teachers whose students have already achieved high standards and maintain them (6)

Causes rivalry between teachers (5)

Does not recognize a good teacher in a school with a poor showing (5)

No consideration for schools that lose students to magnet schools, etc. (2)

No consideration for teachers of problem students or slow students. (2)

The final question on the survey asked the respondents to list any changes they feel should be made in the OEP component. The changes recommended were:

Change or remove baseline requirement on days absent (47)

Include other personnel such as the counselor (15)

Base stipend on academic growth of each teacher's students rather than entire school (14)

Allow teacher to transfer voluntarily and still receive stipend (11)

For each school, establish a level (score) to be maintained and give stipend accordingly (10)

Exclude teachers of electives (P.E., music, etc.) (7)

Have standardized tests administered by personnel other than teachers (7)

Do not group schools on basis of free and reduced lunch (7)

Group magnet schools together (3)

Increase stipend amount (3)

Compare schools by Area (2)

Other miscellaneous comments included:

Eliminate the stipend, spend funds on higher salaries, health benefits, etc. (19)

Plan should be thoroughly explained to teachers (6)

Stipend should be paid in a separate check (4)

Pay stipend earlier (2)

Faculty Advisory Committee Survey Results

Faculty Advisory Committees (FACs) were also surveyed in November, 1980 to determine their views of the OEP component. A survey similar to that sent to instructional staff was mailed to each Faculty Advisory Committee (N = 231). A total of 182 committees returned the survey for a response rate of 79%. The responses from each campus to the survey questions follow.

Question 1: Was your campus eligible for the OEP stipend during the 79-80 school year?

Results: 51% Yes 48% No 1% Do not know

The responses indicate that similar numbers of eligible and ineligible campuses responded to the survey.

Question 2: In your opinion, should teachers be rewarded with a stipend for the outstanding educational progress of their students?

Results: 55% Yes 40% No 3% No opinion 2% No response

Although the overall responses indicate that a majority of FACs believe teachers should be rewarded, there is a discrepancy between the responses from the eligible and ineligible campuses. Seventy-four percent (74%) of the FACS from eligible campuses agreed that teachers should be rewarded, but only 38% of the FACs from ineligible campuses agreed.

Question 3: Do you think that the OEP component, as it is now designed and implemented, should be continued as part of the Second Mile Plan?

Results: 25% Yes 69% No 2% No opinion 4% No response

The majority of FACs responded negatively to the continuation of the OEP component as it is now designed and implemented. When eligible and ineligible campuses are examined, the differences are further apparent. Approximately one-half (54%) of the eligible campuses think it should not be continued, but 89% of ineligible campuses do not want it continued.

When asked to give specific reasons for not continuing the OEP component, the following reasons were given:

Test administration procedures are suspect, fosters unprofessional conduct (30)

Teacher attendance (baseline) should not be a factor for receipt of the stipend (25)

Schoolwide designation of stipend overlooks excellent teachers individually; undeserving personnel qualify for stipend (22)

Test scores are not valid indicator of growth (13)

Grouping of schools works to disadvantage of schools with high achievement levels (11)

Should not be limited to teachers (10)

Free lunch should not be basis for comparison (10)

Encourages teachers to "teach the test" (10)

Competition is divisive (9)

Unfair to hardworking teachers on ineligible campuses (9)

Fails to consider high mobility rate (7)

No need to reward teachers for what they are paid to do (6)

Too much emphasis on testing (6)

Only one-half of the teachers and schools in District can qualify (3)

Good schools in deteriorating neighborhoods cannot realistically expect to equal or surpass test scores (2)

Specific recommendations for changes were requested. The recommendations of the FAC's follow.

Remove baseline attendance requirement from OEP (46)

Allow all personnel on a campus to be eligible (28)

Use outside test administration or monitors (22)

Change attendance requirement-either allow more days or allow job related absences (21)

Award stipend to any school improving its scores (12)

Award stipend to all those who maintain on or above grade level test scores (11)

Include additional factors to compensate for student mobility (10), school population shifts (4), ESL (1), special education (1)

Individual teachers whose students score on or above requirement should be given stipend (10)

Find source other than ITBS for establishing growth (8)

Eliminate competition among schools; each school should be compared to itself (6)

Only teachers who teach tested areas should be compensated (6)

Restrict stipend to classroom teachers and principals only (4)

Develop District pre and posttests for OEP qualification (3)

Use economic level (salary) of individuals who reside in the school community (2)

Award stipend if 3 of 5 grade levels at a school exceed growth of District average (2)

Pay stipend to all teachers if District average is raised (1)

Allocate more money proportionately to campuses showing most growth (1)

Other comments pertaining to the OEP component include the following:

Eliminate stipends (25); apply money to salaries or benefits (33), apply to smaller class size (3), give stipend to each school's general fund or other use (6), money for supplies (2)

Other Input Regarding OEP Component

In addition to the input via the teacher and Faculty Advisory Committee surveys, some direct input was received by the Research Department from schools and from Area offices. This input was obtained through correspondence or visits to campuses by Research personnel to discuss the OEP component. The major concerns of these campuses include the following:

1. A provision is needed to reward schools that are able to maintain "above grade level" scores.

2. Mobility rate and other factors such as number of bilingual and special education students should be considered.

3. Free and reduced lunch is not the best way to group campuses; campuses should compete against their own record.

4. All personnel at an eligible campus should receive the OEP stipend.

These concerns were generally received from campuses that were not eligible for the OEP stipend. They expressed the opinion that they were and have been doing a superior job at their campuses and that the design of the OEP component was not adequate to reward those teachers who have been going the "second mile" for several years. These campuses also felt that they were being punished by the design of this component, i.e. test scores above grade level over a period of time even though the growth was not at a level to be eligible for the stipend. Because only one-half of the campuses are eligible for the stipend, many campuses with superior test scores did not receive the stipend.

Several campuses were displeased with the grouping of campuses for comparison. They felt that the FRL rate was not a valid indicator of socioeconomic status of their students. Therefore they felt that they were being grouped and compared to dissimilar schools. The recommended solution to this situation was to eliminate grouping of schools by FRL and allow each campus to be compared to its own previous year test scores to ascertain level of growth.

Summary of Results

The responses of the teachers, nurses and librarians and the responses from the FACs were generally similar although the teachers were more positive regarding the OEP component than were the FACs. Of all survey respondents (teachers and FACs) a majority (74% or more) of those whose school was eligible for the OEP stipend agreed that teachers should be rewarded for outstanding educational progress of the students. The FACs from ineligible schools were opposed to this concept.

Likewise, approximately one-half of the teachers and one-half of the FACs from eligible schools agreed that the OEP component should be continued as designed. A majority (70% or more) of the teachers and FACs from ineligible campuses responded that they did not want to see the OEP component continued as it is now designed. These results indicate that the OEP component is perceived positively by those teachers and FACs at schools that were eligible for the OEP stipend and negatively perceived by those teachers and FACs at schools that were ineligible.

The following items summarize the major concerns of teachers:

1. Test security - teaching of the test, cheating, test manipulation, administration of test.

2. Baseline attendance requirement - change or eliminate the attendance requirement.

3. Stipend recipients within a campus - desire to include all personnel on the campus including secretarial, custodial, paraprofessional, professional, and administrative.

4. Competition with other campuses - do not like grouping by FRL rate or competing against other campuses. Prefer competing against themselves/their own previous record.

5. Eligibility of only one-half of campuses - prefer that each campus have a chance rather than be limited, by definition, to only one-half of the campuses. Concerned that some schools are being penalized even though test scores are very high.

6. Relevance of other factors related to achievement - other factors related to achievement levels need to be considered when determining if the progress of the students was "outstanding."

Study of the OEP Component
by Research and Evaluation Department

Using the information obtained from the teacher survey, the Faculty Advisory Committee survey, and other input from HISD campuses, the Research and Evaluation personnel began to study ways in which the OEP component might be modified to enhance its utility in the Second Mile Plan. Modifications to the computation of the OEP component are investigated but baseline requirements, test security, and recipients within eligible campuses are not. These items should be considered by the Second Mile Plan Task Force.

Development of New Plan

The essential concern of teachers is the competition aspect of the OEP component. Teachers do not want to compete with other campuses, but would like to compete against the previous achievement level of their campus. Campus A, for example, does not want to be compared to campuses B-L, but would prefer to receive an OEP designation for improving the achievement performance over that made at Campus A the previous year. If Campus A improves achievement levels from 1979 to 1980 then the teachers have indeed contributed to "outstanding educational progress" of their students.

The question becomes that of determining the standard that should be used to ascertain which campuses improved their student performance from year to year. If a simple increase in achievement levels were used to determine OEP campuses, several problems would arise. First, every campus cannot be expected to increase scores each year because they would eventually reach a point where the "ceiling" is reached. Second, there are factors over which teachers have no control which influence how much test scores can increase regardless of what happens in the classroom. It is well documented in educational research that the socioeconomic level of students, for example, is related to their achievement. From the teacher and FAC surveys, teachers listed several factors that they feel influence how much progress students can make. The factors mentioned include mobility rate of the campus, previous achievement levels, proportion of LESA students, proportion of mainstreamed students, teacher turnover rate, proportion of transfer students, and free and reduced lunch rate at the campus. The teachers reported that these factors or "givens" of a campus are important and should be considered when a determination is made as to whether the achievement gains made at their campus are reflective of "outstanding educational progress."

A solution to this problem appears to be the establishment of a standard that will allow each campus to compete with their own previous achievement while considering the factors that influence how much progress can be made at each campus.

One possible solution involves the use of a statistical procedure called regression analysis. Regression analysis has the capability of using the "givens" or factors that teachers feel impact the achievement gains that can possibly be made by their students to determine what score a campus should be able to achieve. For example, when the factors are considered, Campus A might be expected to increase their test scores by one (1) month, but Campus B, with a different set of factors, might be expected to only maintain the same scores they had the previous year. For each campus, a score could be calculated that represents how the school should score when the factors are taken into consideration. This score could become the standard against which a campus would compare itself. If their achievement performance at the campus exceeded the standard for their campus, then it could be determined that the students made "outstanding educational progress" and the campus would be designated as an OEP campus.

The regression analysis method, as described, addresses specific concerns expressed by teachers and FACs. That is,

1. Campuses would not compete with any other campus. Each campus would instead compete with itself in trying to attain or maintain a certain achievement level.

2. All schools, including high achieving campuses, would have an equal chance to earn the OEP stipend since no limit to the number of campuses is set.

3. Factors that are related to achievement would be the factors used to "predict" a campus' expected or predicted score.

Other benefits of such a plan include:

1. All students scores are included to determine if a stipend is received, not just the scores of students who could be "matched" from one year to the next year.

2. Realistic "predicted" scores can be set because the predictions would be based, in part, on previous achievement levels within the District.

3. Teachers would be rewarded for exceeding expectations thereby bolstering the concept of "outstanding educational progress."

The new plan for computing the OEP stipend was developed using data from the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years. The following steps were followed in the development of the plan.

1. A data file was constructed with the following factors for each campus:

   - free and reduced lunch rate
   - mobility rate
   - proportion of LESA students
   - proportion of special education students (not self contained)
   - proportion of student transfers (by types)
   - teacher turnover rate
   - 1979 and 1980 achievement data

2. Statistical analyses of the data were performed to examine the relationship among the factors under study and to determine which of the factors could be used to accurately "predict" the Spring, 1980 test scores.

3. The factors which could most accurately determine or predict the Spring, 1980 scores were identified.

4. The number of campuses that would be eligible under this plan were examined.

As a result of these analyses, an equation was developed that could be used to reliably predict a school's test scores. Previous educational research was confirmed in that the best indicator or predictor of a student's test score was previous test scores and socioeconomic status. All of the other factors contributed, in a small amount, to the prediction of 1980 test scores.

Fiscal Impact

When the equation was used to predict each campus' Spring 1980 NCE test score, 78 elementary campuses (47%) had a Spring 1980 score that exceeded their predicted score. At the secondary level, 48% of the junior high/middle schools and 52% of the senior high/special schools exceeded their predicted score (see Tables 1-3 in Appendix B).

Percent of Campuses
Exceeding Spring 1980 Predicted Score

Elementary	47%
Junior/Middle	48%
Senior/Special	52%

Since approximately 50% of the campuses would qualify for the stipend when this regression analysis method is used to determine OEP campuses, the fiscal impact of this stipend will not change.

RECOMMENDATION

It is our recommendation to the Second Mile Plan Task Force that the OEP stipend designation be calculated using the regression analysis method, as outlined in this document, for the 1981-82 school year. This recommendation addresses many of the concerns expressed by teachers and by the Faculty Advisory Committees which relate to the method of identifying OEP campuses.

SMP3-3jk

APPPENDIX A

Instructional Staff Survey
Outstanding Educational Progress (OEP) Stipend
October, 1980

1. Was the campus you worked at during the 79-80 school year, eligible for the Outstanding Educational Progress stipend?

   ____ Yes ____ No ____ Do Not Know

2. In your opinion, should teachers be rewarded with a stipend for outstanding educational progress of their students?

   ____ Yes ____ No ____ No Opinion

3. Do you think that the OEP component, as it is now designed and implemented, should be continued as a part of the Second Mile Plan?

   ____ Yes ____ No ____ No Opinion

   If no, why not?_____

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. Please list any <u>changes</u> you feel should be made in the OEP component of the Second Mile Plan. Please be as <u>specific</u> as possible.

   a. _____

   _____

   b. _____

   _____

   c. _____

   _____

   d. _____

   _____

Please list additional suggestions on a separate page. Return to: Research, Evaluation and Accreditation, Admin. Annex, Route 10.

Thank you for your assistance.

O-1SMP2-ES19jk

PLEASE RETURN BY THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1980

APPENDIX B

Elementary Schools Eligible
For OEP Stipend Using New Plan

A	B	C	D
° Lovett*	° Neff*	° Longfellow*	Cunningham*
° Bell*	° Askew*	Richmond/McNamara*	° Garden Oaks*
White*	° Parker*	Whittier*	Oak Forest*
° Ashford*	° Kolter*	° Poe*	Lewis*
° Briargrove*	° Condit*	° Roberts*	Barrick*
Red	Stevens	River Oaks	Emerson
° Bonham	Elrod	° Sutton	DeChaumes
° Horn	° Helrod	Anderson	Almeda
° West University	Benbrook	° Wainwright	° Gordon
° Walnut Bend	Sinclair	° Patterson	Windsor Village

E	F	G	H
° Grissom*	° Garden Villas*	° Montgomery*	° Field*
Rucker*	Bonner*	° Codwell*	Jefferson*
° Foerster*	Cornelius*	Park Place*	Coop*
Pleasantville*	° Twain*	Petersen*	° Golfcrest*
Smith, K.*	° Harris, R.P. *	Fondren*	° Mading*
Durham	Brookline	Braeburn	Southmayd
Mitchell	Law	Scarborough	Burtink
Durkee	° Oates	Shearn	Janowski
Rogers	Northline	Gregg	Love
Pilgrim	° Wilson	Hobby	Piney Point

I	J	K	L
° Peck*	° Turner*	° Browning*	° Pugh*
° Houston Gardens*	Briscoe*	° Scroggins*	° Stevenson*
° Cage*	MacGregor*	° Reynolds*	DeZavala*
Harvard*	Henderson, J. P.*	Berry*	° Concord*
° Roosevelt*	Alcott*	° Allen*	Kennedy*
° Helms	° Bastian	Southland/Thompson	Frost
Washington, Geo.	Travis	Alamo	Brock
Cooley	Chatham	Osborne	° Harris, J. R.
° Rhoads	Hohl	Eliot	° MacArthur
Memorial	Grimes	° Holden	Isaacs

M	N	O	P
° Lantrip*	° Jones, J. Will*	Douglass*	° Blackshear*
° Looscan*	Kashmere Gardens*	Langston*	° McDade*
° Dodson*	° Burnet*	Crawford*	° Jones, Anson*
° Foster*	Lee*	° Sherman*	° Wesley*
Lamar*	Fairchild*	° Wharton*	Crockett*
° Hartsfield	° Sunnyside	° Lockhart	Scott
° Kelso	° Bowie	° Dunbar	° Henderson, N.Q.
Burrus	Whidby	Ross	Pleasants
Franklin	° Rusk	Clinton	Sanderson
° Easter	Carnegie	Port Houston	Milam

Q
° Harper*
° Ryan*
Gregory*
Dow*
° Highland Heights*
° Atherton
Bruce
° Eighth Avenue
Dogan

* Schools eligible for OEP stipend in 1979-80 school year.
° Schools eligible for OEP stipend using new plan

Junior High/Middle Schools Eligible
For OEP Stipend Using New Plan

A	B	C
• Rogers*	• Pershing*	• Deady*
• Sharpstown Jr.*	CLC*	• Dowling*
• Fondren*	• Lanier*	Woodson*
Johnston	Black	Thomas
Long	Revere †	Henry
Welch †	Clifton †	Attucks

D	E	F
Hartman*	• Terrell*	Jackson*
• Fonville*	McReynolds*	Hogg*
Cullen*	Marshall*	Smith*
• Hamilton	Edison	• Key
• Burbank	• Fleming	Williams
Holland †	• Ryan	

Table 3

Senior High Schools Eligible
For OEP Stipend Using New Plan

A	B	C
Madison*	• Lamar*	• Reagan*
• Bellaire*	Jordan*	• Scarborough*
Waltrip*	• Furr*	• Kashmere*
Westbury	• Jones	• Austin
• Lee	Sam Houston	Worthing
Sharpstown	Milby	Sterling

D	E**
• Davis*	HSPVA*
• Wheatley*	Health Professions*
On Going Education*	Night HS
Lincoln* †	
B. T. Washington	
Yates	
CLC	

* Schools eligible for OEP stipend in 1979-80 school year.
** Special Schools, no free and reduced lunch rate for these campuses.
• Schools eligible for OEP stipend using new plan.
† Welch, Revere, Clifton, Holland and Lincoln did not have 2 years test data (1978-79 and 1979-80)